

# Program Evaluation: Back on Track – Los Angeles

American Society of Criminology Meetings – 2018 – Atlanta, GA

KEVIN WALKER, M.S.

ALEXANDER M. HOLSINGER, PH.D.

RANDIE C. CHANCE, PH.D.

# The problem

2

- ▶ What California has been faced with
  - ▶ Prison populations
  - ▶ Judicial orders
  - ▶ New legislation

# The Program

3

- ▶ Origination
- ▶ Purpose
- ▶ Target Population
- ▶ Program process & description

# Program Evaluation Groups and Measures

- ▶ Two-group design: BOT-LA vs. Control group
- ▶ Both groups assessed/compared regarding criminal history
- ▶ Both groups provide pre-and-post measures
  - ▶ Client Evaluation of Self and Treatment (CEST)
  - ▶ Criminal Thinking Scale (CST)
- ▶ Both groups being tracked for standardized recidivism measures (3 year outcome period)

# Current analysis

5

- ▶ Utilizes cases (from both groups) that were released before January 1, 2017
  - ▶ Complete measures for all pre-post assessment
- ▶ Focuses on psychometric measures derived from CEST & CTS and the COMPAS risk/needs assessment
- ▶ Examined all comparisons (both intra-group and inter-group comparisons were made)

# COMPAS risk/needs assessment

6

- ▶ Primary offender risk/need assessment in California
- ▶ Includes static and dynamic (mostly dynamic) items
  - ▶ Can measure change over time and w/intervention
- ▶ Assesses a comprehensive array of relevant criminogenic risk and need domains and factors
- ▶ Used in risk/need classification, and case planning

# TCU's CEST – several scales derived

7

- ▶ Desire for help
- ▶ Treatment readiness
- ▶ Treatment needs
- ▶ Pressure for treatment
- ▶ Self esteem
- ▶ Depression
- ▶ Anxiety
- ▶ Decision making
- ▶ Hostility
- ▶ Risk taking
- ▶ Treatment participation
- ▶ Treatment satisfaction



# TCU's CTS

8

- ▶ Entitlement
- ▶ Justification
- ▶ Power orientation
- ▶ Cold heartedness
- ▶ Criminal rationalization
- ▶ Personal irresponsibility



# Results – group equivalency

9

- ▶ BOT-LA and control groups equivalent re: race and age
- ▶ BOT-LA and control groups equivalent re: several criminal history measures
  - ▶ # arrests and # of convictions for total, person, property, drug, and "other"
- ▶ Some criminal history differences (BOT-LA vs. control group)
  - ▶ Age @ first arrest (BOT-LA group older)
  - ▶ Control group had more person-related ARRESTS
  - ▶ BOT-LA group had more person-related CONVICTIONS
- ▶ Overall no grave concerns re: criminal history equivalency

# Results – COMPAS data

10

- ▶ BOT-LA and control groups:
  - ▶ Statistically the same at pre-COMPAS measure
  - ▶ Approached significant difference at post-COMPAS measure
- ▶ Control group:
  - ▶ Statistically the same when comparing pre- to post-COMPAS
- ▶ BOT-LA group:
  - ▶ Statistically significant decrease in overall risk/need comparing pre- to post-COMPAS
- ▶ Note: These results were generated utilizing the COMPAS categorizations as quantitative scores, not raw scores

# Results – CEST data

11

- ▶ Desire for help
  - ▶ Groups statistically the same at pre-measure
  - ▶ BOT-LA scored significantly better than control at post-measure
  - ▶ Control scored significantly worse comparing pre- to post internally
- ▶ Self-perceived needs for treatment
  - ▶ Control nearly significant reduction pre-to post internally
  - ▶ BOT-LA remained the same pre- to post
- ▶ Pressure for treatment
  - ▶ Control had significant reduction comparing pre- to post
  - ▶ BOT-LA remained the same pre- to post

# Results – CEST data (cont.)

12

- ▶ Self-esteem
  - ▶ BOT-LA scored significantly higher than control at both pre- and post measures. Higher at post.
- ▶ Depression
  - ▶ BOT-LA and control were the same at pre-measure
  - ▶ BOT-LA and control significantly different at post (control more depressed)
- ▶ Decision making
  - ▶ BOT-LA scored significantly higher than control at both pre- and post measures. Higher at post.

- ▶ Entitlement
  - ▶ BOT-LA scored significantly lower than control at pre
  - ▶ BOT-LA scored significantly lower than control at post
  - ▶ Neither group evinced internal change when comparing pre- to post
- ▶ Justification (of antisocial behavior)
  - ▶ BOT-LA and control were statistically the same at pre
  - ▶ BOT-LA scored significantly lower than control at post
  - ▶ Neither group evinced statistically significant change internally, however, control group increased, while BOT-LA decreased



# Results – CTS data (cont.)

14

- ▶ Criminal rationalization
  - ▶ BOT-LA displayed statistically significant decrease from pre- to post
  - ▶ Control group the same comparing pre- to post
- ▶ Personal irresponsibility
  - ▶ BOT-LA and control were the same at pre
  - ▶ BOT-LA scored significantly lower than control at post
  - ▶ BOT-LA displayed a significant decrease when comparing pre to post
  - ▶ Control remained the same when comparing pre to post

# Results – COMPAS subscales

15

- ▶ Control displayed significant increase (pre to post) on anger (BOT-LA showed no change pre to post)
- ▶ Control displayed significant increase (pre to post) on need for cognitive behavioral interventions (BOT-LA showed no change pre to post)
- ▶ Control displayed significant increase (pre to post) re: financial difficulties (BOT-LA showed a non-significant decrease)
- ▶ BOT-LA displayed significant decrease on general propensity for recidivism comparing pre to post (control decreased as well, but not significantly)



## Results – COMPAS subscales (cont.)

16

- ▶ Control displayed statistically significant increase re: residential instability (pre to post); BOT-LA showed no substantive or significant change pre to post
- ▶ Control group displayed statistically significant increase (pre to post) re: social isolation; BOT-LA showed no substantive or significant change pre to post

# One Year Recidivism Measures

17

- ▶ BOT-LA arrested for less “other” offense-level crimes (not felony or misdemeanor)
- ▶ BOT-LA arrested for less “other” crimes (not person, property or drug)
- ▶ BOT convicted for less felony drug crimes
- ▶ Control convicted for less misdemeanor offenses

# Conclusions and next steps

18

- ▶ Some evidence of program impact
  - ▶ BOT-LA appears to be performing better on scales
  - ▶ Some pre-programming group differences exist but not critical
- ▶ More recidivism data being collected
- ▶ Several measures of recidivism being developed/tracked
  - ▶ New arrest post-release
  - ▶ New conviction post-release
  - ▶ New return to jail post-release
  - ▶ New return to prison post-release
- ▶ Future analyses to utilize multivariate modeling, incorporating control where needed

# Contact

19

Research.Center@doj.ca.gov

<https://oag.ca.gov/research-center>